DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 771 FL 020 990

AUTHOR Manuel-Dupont, Sonia
TITLE Narrative Literacy Patterns of Northern Ute Adolescent Students.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 43p.; In: Reyhner, Jon, Ed. Effective Language Education Practices and Native Language Survival. Proceedings of the Annual International Native American Language Issues Institute (9th, Billings, Montana, June 8-9, 1989); see ED 342 512.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *American Indian Languages; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *Language Acquisition; Language of Instruction; Language Usage; *Narration; Native Speakers; Oral Language
IDENTIFIERS *Ute; *Ute (Tribe)

ABSTRACT

The relationship between oral language and academic success as a rationale for the study of narrative structures is discussed in order to determine Northern Ute children's acquisition of "school language" structures. In addition, this paper compares hypotheses concerning the expected linguistic behavior of Northern Ute children in retelling narratives with actual narrative-retelling skills of 41 children to determine if Ute children: (1) demonstrate the ability to retell narratives, (2) construct narratives in a manner predicted by research on mainstream (predominantly Anglo) children, and (3) construct narratives in a manner predicted by previous research on adult and adolescent Northern Utes. It is concluded that success in teaching school-language will be accomplished only when both students and teachers recognize the existence, importance, and functions of the home- and school-language traditions and do not try to learn or teach one to the exclusion of the other. Just as Northern Ute children have demonstrated the ability to use context-controlled story grammar categories, they should be given the opportunity to expand this skill into context-controlled language traditions. Contains 33 references. (LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jon Reyhner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED354771.

Narrative Literacy Patterns of Northern Ute Adolescent Students

Sonia Manuel-Dupont

The first purpose of this paper[1] is to discuss the relationship between oral language and academic success as a rationale for the study of narrative structures to determine Northern Ute children's acquisition of "school language" structures. The second purpose is to compare hypotheses concerning the expected linguistic behavior of Northern Ute children in retelling narratives with actual narrative-retelling skills of 41 children to determine if Ute children:

1. demonstrate the ability to retell narratives,
2. construct narratives in a manner predicted by research on mainstream (predominantly Anglo) children, and
3. construct narratives in a manner predicted by previous research on adult and adolescent Northern Utes.

The linguistic and educational heritage of modern Northern Ute English speakers is well documented in William Leap's article, "Pathways and barriers toward Ute language literacy development on the Northern Ute

FL 020 990

[1]This research was funded through a Faculty Research Grant from the Utah State University Office of Research. My thanks to Carol Strong, William Leap, Marilyn Cleckler, Michelle Gee, the staff of the Ute Family English Literacy Program, and the principals, teachers, and children of Todd and Lapoint schools for participation in this project, comments on drafts, and data analysis.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reservation" (in press). To briefly sum up his discussion, he outlines six different language traditions on the Northern Ute reservation: language traditions from three Northern Ute bands, Basin English, Standard English, and Ute English. The language varieties of the three Northern Ute bands represent the ancestral languages; Basin English represents the linguistic patterns found in the speech of the largely (though not solely) non-Indian population in the Unitah basin area; Standard English represents the form of English taught in the public schools; and Ute English represents the informal English used by most Northern Ute English speakers. It is important to note that these language traditions are not independent nor exclusive of each other. Indeed most adult Northern Ute (referred to hereafter as Ute) speakers are communicatively competent in two or more of these language traditions.

Yet, despite this rich and varied language background, Ute students do not achieve the same level of academic attainment as their Anglo counterparts. Leap (in press) notes that educational achievement on the Northern Ute reservation resembles that of other American Indian communities. "60% of all Ute adults have not completed high school, and overall, the median educational level attained by the on-reservation population is 10th grade." He also notes that, "the average academic achievement level for adults seeking to improve basic skills when they enter the tribe's Adult Education program is seventh grade, second month and their average level of reading and writing skills is even lower (sixth grade, fifth month and fifth grade, third month, respectively)".

It is for this reason and others that representatives from the Ute English Family Literacy program contacted researchers to determine what kinds of English literacy skills adolescent children were demonstrating in their school settings. In addition, it was hoped that the results of this research could be used to train local teachers to design more appropriate curriculum for Ute students which would allow them to achieve better academic success.

Oral Language and Academic Success

In the past decade numerous researchers have examined the relationship between verbal language proficiency and academic success (Heath, 1982; Wallach & Butler, 1984; Simon, 1985; Westby, 1985; Wallach & Miller, 1988; Ripich, 1989; Wallach, 1989). From research on minority, mainstream, and handicapped populations we have learned that the first step to academic success involves becoming literate. In turn, becoming literate involves learning how to learn within a clearly defined curriculum and acquiring a specialized dialect of language -- school language.

The former skill involves the ability to manage large amounts of information in efficient and effective ways, the ability to express what is known, and the ability to record information for future use (Wallach & Miller, 1988). Ripich (1989) adds that when we expect students to manage, express, and record information we expect that they will become knowledgeable of not only the lesson content but also the appropriate discourse rules for teacher-learner exchanges. In other words, in addition to math, spelling, and science, these students are expected to learn how and when to pay attention, how to take turns in conversational interactions, how to cohesively tie new and old information together for the benefit of the listener/reader, how to repair miscommunications, and how to adjust their discourse roles with teachers and classmates appropriately.

The ability to appropriately associate these socio-linguistic skills with the learning of content areas is intimately tied to the young adolescent's home language and early learning experiences before entering school. These experiences shape how the child perceives the task of learning and his/her role with that task. As can be seen in Table 1, the skills involved in learning to communicate (oral language) in the home environment are very different from the skills involved in learning to learn (literate language) in the school environment.

The language of the home, represented by the oral language portion of the continuum, is characterized by 1) concrete vocabulary, 2) familiar terms, 3) topics about objects,

people, and ideas in the immediate environment, and 4) genuine conversational roles. In other words, in the home environment children learn to use a style of oral language that will get their real needs met in an unambiguous and efficient manner. They understand that in the home questions generally arise from the immediate context, interaction with conversational partners is genuine and symmetrical, and that a great deal of information can be conveyed through the nonlinguistic cues of intonation, body posturing, and shared information. Most importantly, at home, large chunks of knowledge are assumed to be shared by the listener, thus the use of elaborate explanations and descriptions of shared events is usually unnecessary.

Table I: Oral-Literate Continuum

Oral Language (Learning to Talk)	**Literate Language (Learning to Learn)**
Language Function	
Regulates social interaction	Regulates thinking/planning
Requesting & commanding	Reflecting & seeking information
Genuine questions	Many pseudo questions
Symmetrical interaction	Asymmetrical interaction
Language Topic	
Here and now	There and then
Talk topically	Talk to the topic
Meaning comes from context	Meaning comes from inference from text
Language Structure	
Familiar words	Unfamiliar words
Redundant syntax	Concise syntax
Deictics & formulaic expressions	Explicit vocabulary
Cohesion based on intonation	Cohesion based on explicit linguistic markers

(Based on Learning to talk--talking to learn: Oral-literate language differences by C. Westby, 1985, In C. Simon (Ed.) *Communication skills and classroom success: Therapy methodologies for language-learning disabled students* (pp. 182-213). San Diego, CA: College-Hill)

The language of the school, on the other hand, is characterized by unfamiliar vocabulary, text- or teacher-oriented topics, social interactions that involve extrapolating information from texts and unfamiliar environments for unfamiliar purposes, and many question-answer interactions designed to promote or display learning of curricular material. In the school environment children must learn to use oral language to demonstrate learning and to seek new information. These activities involve 1) learning to use less familiar, more concise vocabulary, 2) relying less on intonation and body posturing, and 3) being able to remove events from the immediate context for discussion over many communicative turns. In addition, in the school environment, it is unlikely that all conversational partners will share the same knowledge base as the child. Thus, more emphasis must be placed on understanding and displaying the appropriate amount of information to best meet the listener's/reader's needs.

This kind of school language is not learned with the same ease or strategies by all cultures. In seminal works by Tough (1977), Heath (1980, 1982a, 1982b), Scribner and Cole (1981), and Scollon and Scollon (1981) it was shown that not all cultures use language and literacy for the same purposes nor do they structure home language interactions with children in the same way. Those cultures which use a decontextualized language for reflecting, reasoning, and planning generally exhibit greater ease in acquiring and using school language than do those cultures that rely almost exclusively on a contextually dependent use of language. In addition, some cultures use oral language more than others with varying degrees of emphasis on the importance of children's use of language for planning, interpreting, reasoning, predicting, and so forth. While some parents feel that it is important to teach, stimulate, and model language for children, others feel that children "just learn" language on their own and intervention or teaching is unnecessary.

As an example of both points of view, in Heath's (1982b, 1983) study of three communities in the Carolina Piedmonts, she found that middle class mainstream parents tended to

highly structure their children's language development by providing models, feedback, corrections, elaborations, demonstrations, and overt explanations of words, their meanings and usages. In providing the "scaffolding" for emerging structures in their children's speech, these parents actually previewed many of the learning techniques and activities their children would encounter in their first years of school. Because these children had "practiced" learning and using language in decontextualized situations, they had fewer difficulties learning school language than did their counterparts in two other Carolina communities who had not experienced modeling and scaffolding as part of their home language experience. As Westby (1985, p. 185) stated, "The more a culture's use of language differs from that of the schools, the more likely it is that children in that culture will experience difficulty with the school tasks. Such children come to school having learned to talk, but not having talked to learn."

In order to understand how well children are learning and using school language Westby (1985) has suggested that the narrative structures of children be investigated. She argued that narratives provide the best data for understanding the transition from home language to school language for a number of reasons. First, they are the first language form that requires the speaker to produce an extended monologue wherein all information must be conveyed by the linguistic forms in the narrative without input from the listener/reader (as would be found in a typical dialogue situation). Secondly, oral narratives have a unique fluency and prosody not occurring in dialogues, because dialogues often consist of pauses, false starts, repetitions, and information carried by body posturing and affirmations of shared knowledge. Thirdly, oral narratives combine structural aspects of both home and school language because the original speaker's context and prosodic cues are not present. Of necessity the speaker is distanced from the actual event; therefore, he/she must be explicit regarding the setting, motivation, and characters of the story. Finally all cultures use language for narrative purposes, thus even children who have not had

extensive practice with school language and its usages will have used some type of narratives in their home environment.

This ability to use appropriate narrative structures in the home environment, but not the school environment, is borne out by Leap's research (1988, in press) on Northern Ute and Northern Ute English where speakers do not show hesitation in constructing appropriate home-language narratives while expressing hesitation and uncertainty in many school-language narrative tasks. In addition, Ute children's ease in constructing narratives, but not ones which comply with school-language requirements, is aptly demonstrated by Lewis (1988). She compared the narrative construction abilities of Anglo children and Ute children on descriptive and speculative tasks and clearly showed that Ute students do not successfully separate the narrative from the actual event, that they rely heavily on audience participation to supply meaning to the text, and they rely on the serial presentation of undistinguished details rather than decontextualized scaffolds of information to establish the story setting and character motivation. In contrast, Anglo children demonstrated the ability to decontextualize the narrative from the actual event, to appropriately provide information to meet the listener's needs, and to provide appropriate setting and character motivation.

To better understand how these and other mainstream children learned to mold home-language narrative structures into school-language narrative structures, the developmental research of Karmiloff-Smith (1985) provides some interesting insights. The basic outline of her three phases of development are shown in Table 2. As can be seen from the examples in the table, when mainstream children first learn to tell narratives, they concentrate on getting the data correct without attempting to link units of the story together (Phase 1). As they gain more experience with narrative structure, the emphases change and they concentrate on the organizational properties of the story to the exclusion of details (Phase 2). Finally, they combine the two strategies using both detailed explanations and organizational links between sentences and

events in the story (Phase 3). For the groups of students studied (first, second, and fourth graders), it was at Phase 3 that Lewis (1988) found most of her Anglo subjects and Phase 2 for the Ute subjects, regardless of age or grade placement.

Table 2: Phases of narrative development

1. **Phase 1: data-driven**
   - -syntactically correct utterances
   - **-no organizational properties of a narrative**
   - -no attempts to link behavioral events

   There's a boy and a dog. He has a net and a bucket. The boy is looking at the frog. He is smiling. The boy is running down the hill. He trips over the tree. He falls in the water.

2. **Phase 2: top-down control**
   - -children recognize that events in the story are related
   - -make story form a single coherent unit
   - **-goal is to tell gist of story**
   - **-details are sacrificed to structure of story**

   The boy and the dog are going fishing. The boy sees a frog. He picks up his bucket and tries to catch the frog. He misses and the frog gets away.

3. **Phase 3: data-driven combined with top-down control**
   - -dynamic interaction between data-driven and top-down processes
   - **-story details fuller**
   - **-higher order story organization patterns**

   Once there was a boy who wanted to go fishing with his dog. He took his fishing net and his bucket. When he got to the pond, he saw a frog. He decided to try and catch the frog, so he ran down the hill, but he tripped over the tree and fell in the water. . .

(Based on Language and cognitive processes from a developmental perspective by A. Karmiloff-Smith, 1985, *Language and Cognitive Processes, 1*, 61-85.)

While it is interesting to look at phases of narrative development from a holistic point of view, some children's narratives do not fall neatly into the three categories listed above while other children's narratives are in transition between one phase and the next. In addition, some non-mainstream children do not clearly demonstrate that they follow the sequential phases of this narrative development model. Therefore a more detailed analysis is needed to understand what structures are involved in each phase and how a child manipulates these structures to move between phases. Stein and Glenn (1979) proposed such an analysis by separating narratives into seven discrete story grammar categories which are used to construct narratives. Table 3 gives a complete listing of these categories and their meanings.

Table 3: Story grammar categories

1. **Setting (S)** statements introduce the main character(s) and describe the story content.
2. **Initiating Events (IE)** are occurrences that cause the protagonist to act.
3. **Attempts (A)** indicate the protagonist's overt action(s) to obtain the goal(s).
4. **Plans (P)** indicate the intended action of the protagonist.
5. **Internal Responses (IR)** refer to the goals, thoughts, and feelings of the protagonist
6. **Direct Consequences (C)**indicate the success or failure of the protagonist in attaining the goal(s).
7. **Reactions (R)** indicate the protagonist's feelings about attaining or not attaining the goals.

(Based on "An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children" by N. Stein and C. Glenn, 1979, in R. Freedle (Ed.) *New directions in discourse processing* (Vol. 2, pp. 53-120). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.)

Previous research on narrative skills

Previous research on mainstream and Ute children's narratives was examined to predict how Northern Ute children would structure their oral narratives.

Mainstream children: Developmental aspects of story-telling grammars have been studied mostly through story-retelling tasks. This occurs when the child is presented with a story in some form and is asked to retell the story in their own words. From these studies it has been found that children by age 5 or 6 already demonstrate knowledge of narrative structure (that is, they can use all seven story grammar categories), but that the amount of information recalled from the stories increases with age. In addition, Stein and Glenn (1979) found that setting statements, initiating events and consequences were the story categories most likely to be recalled.

Excluding these three categories, which all age groups are most likely to recall, Page and Stewart (1985) found that younger children, older children, and adults differ in terms of the *specific* categories they recall. Younger children focus on consequences (Stein & Glenn, 1979); older children focus on goals (internal responses), attempts and endings (Mandler & Johnson, 1977; Stein & Glenn, 1979); and adults focus on reactions and endings (Mandler & Johnson, 1977). In developmental terms, primary plots (those proceeding from initiating events to the direct consequence) emerge earlier than secondary plots (those which contain responses, plans, and attempts). From the different focus in plot construction, it is clear why there are differences between younger and older children's narratives (Botvin & Sutton-Smith, 1977).

The story-teller's remembrance of these categories does not seem to be affected by category saliency. Younger children continue to focus on consequences and older children on goals, attempts, and endings despite the number of times these categories occur in each episode. In addition, the order of story events or episodes is generally preserved with a high rate of accuracy by all age groups (Mandler & Johnson, 1977) even though information, not present in but related to the original

story, is frequently added during recall (Mandler & Johnson, 1977; Stein & Glenn, 1979).

Learning disabled children also show an understanding of story structure but are more likely to produce shorter stories with an "impoverished" story line than are normal language children. This "impoverishment" comes from the use of fewer details and propositions to generate the text and in leaving out information about characters' responses, plans, and attempts. Roth and Spekman (1986) theorized that one reason for this "impoverishment" may be an impaired recognition of the need to share this knowledge with others. This result of this omission is an increased burden on the listener to make inferences regarding the character's thoughts, feelings, attitudes, goals, motivations, and behaviors.

What is interesting about this tendency is its similarity to the structure of oral conversations where these same categories are often left unspecified or negotiated through turn-taking. Thus it appears that learning disabled students model narratives very closely on a dyadic conversational model. They either assume that the listener will actively interpret and participate in the discourse event, or they are unable to convey information even though they know its needed by the listener. In contrast, normal-language children are able to structure stories to meet the needs of the listener even at a young age.

Ute children: While an abundance of specific information on the story grammars of Ute children and adults is not available, there are numerous ethnographic and linguistic descriptions of both Northern Ute and Ute English narratives. Leap (1988, 1989, 1990, in press) and Lewis (1988) have argued convincingly that both traditional oral Northern Ute texts and written narratives of adolescent Ute English speaking children have the following shared characteristics:

1. Speakers establish narrative ownership of the oral text. That is, speakers take the narrative and fit it into the immediate context. In doing so, each speaker adds, subtracts or modifies the story to make it "his/her story" as best fits the situation.

2. Narratives rarely begin with elaborate introductory/orientation details to provide scene-setting unless the speaker/writer feels that this elaboration is necessary for the setting.
3. Narratives rarely offer preliminary comment on character attitude or motivation unless the speaker/writer feels that this commentary is necessary for the setting.
4. Narratives cut right to the heart of the plot, eliminating details which the speaker/writer deems unnecessary to the story or already understood by the audience. Details and elaboration may be added if the speaker/writer feels the time allotment for the task will allow this.
5. Retold narratives maintain the basic parameters set up by the target version of the text but are based on central themes, which are built up comment by comment, forcing listeners/readers to infer the purpose of the text from the whole of the text, not from the meaning of any single segment, i.e. an introductory statement.
6. Narrative performance relies upon frequent appeal to inference and frequent involvement of the listener/reader as a participant in the discourse process.

In Leap's paper in this volume, "Written Ute English: Texture, Construction, and Point of View," he reiterates the importance of understanding the non-exhaustive presentation of meaning and the active engagement required of the listener/reader for this type of text interpretation. A text which clearly follows these characteristics will require that the listener/reader contribute meaning to the text by filling in setting and character motivation information, by supplying pertinent details which are not stated but are predictable from the plot, by distinguishing importance among the details supplied, and by assuming responsibility for text purpose interpretation at the end of the narrative. Lewis (1988) also notes that readers/listeners will have to infer reference from exhaustive use of distanced pronouns and enormous amounts of undistinguished story detail.

Neither Leap nor Lewis have specifically investigated developmental trends in narrative structure, thus it is unknown whether younger children and older children will display the same kinds of narrative strategies. In addition there is no available information on the text constructing abilities of language-disabled Ute children.

Predictions: Based on these descriptions, we would then expect Ute children's English story-retelling narratives to have an amalgamation of characteristics from both linguistic perspectives, as these children have access to many varieties of English in addition to many varieties of Northern Ute. From a standard English developmental point of view we would expect Ute children 1) to have fully developed story grammars, 2) to tell the events in the same order as the target story, 3) to remember settings, initiating events, and consequences, 4) to focus the narrative on attempts, internal responses, and consequences, and 5) to understand the difference between an oral narrative and a dyadic conversation so that the listener is provided with enough details to understand the story.

From a Northern Ute and Ute English language point of view we would expect these adolescent children 1) to maintain the basic story line, 2) to shorten the story by leaving out peripheral events and unnecessary detail, not to mention character motivation and attitude or personal evaluation of the story content (internal responses and reactions), 3) to minimize details about the setting, and 4) to expect that the listener will share the same world of knowledge, thus will assume an active role in interpreting the text.

From these two areas of research it can be seen that several of the predictions are similar. Others, however are in direct contradiction. Therefore, the unknown areas of these children's stories will be the way in which they handle:

1. Length of text
2. Usage of detail and explanation vs. brevity of text
3. Usage of story grammar categories
   a. Settings and orientations to characters and plots

   b. Use of internal responses, initiating events, and consequences
4. Use of narrative ownership (to change, add, delete material) vs. addition of material to the text not in the original text

Method

Subjects: Forty-one children, 19 males and 22 females from the third through the fifth grades, were selected from a pool of students at Todd and Lapoint Elementary Schools in the Unitah Basin in Utah. In considering subjects for this study, children were chosen to meet these criteria:

1. an equal number of males and females at each grade level
2. an equal number of children at each grade level
3. normal hearing, vision, and range of intelligence as indicated on school records
4. no evidence of organic disorders
5. a good attendance record (since subjects would be required to meet with the researcher for 5 separate sessions over a two-week period of time)
6. parental permission for testing granted in writing

The children selected to participate in the study had an age range from eight years, one month to eleven years, six months. The average age was nine years, six months. 27% of the subjects were eight-year olds, 34% of the subjects were nine-year olds, 36% were ten-year olds, and 2% were eleven-year olds. Thirteen were in the third grade, 15 were in the fourth grade, and 13 were in the fifth grade. Owing to absenteeism, it was not possible to evenly match subjects for sex or grade level.

Materials: Each subject was shown four equivalent slide-tape presentations prepared by Strong (1989) based on the wordless picture books by Mercer Mayer: 1) *A boy, a dog and a frog*, 2) *Frog, where are you?*, 3) *Frog goes to dinner*, and 4) *One frog too many*. The picture books were made into slides, and scripts were written for each slide to be balanced for number of sentences, words, average words per sentence,

number of complex sentences, number of major episodes, number of main characters, and gender of main characters. The slides were then narrated by a professional narrator in a recording studio (For a complete description of the production of these materials, see Strong, 1989). In addition each child was tested using the Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation (Goldman & Fristoe, 1986) and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-R (Dunn & Dunn, 1981).

Procedures: Each child was seen five times. In the first session the child was administered the Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-R according to the protocol manual procedures. All responses were tape-recorded. He/She was then told about the study and requested to come back for a second session in two days in which he/she and one or two other children from his/her grade would watch a slide-tape presentation then tell the examiner the story they had just seen.

In the second session, children from each grade were randomly placed in groups of two or three and brought into the examination room to view the practice slide-tape. They were again briefed on the study, familiarized with the equipment, and allowed to ask questions. They were then instructed that they would watch a practice story together and when it was over they were to tell the examiner the whole story from beginning to end in their own words. They were encouraged to tell the story as a group or individually, whichever they preferred, into the tape recorder. After each group had practiced telling the story, the groups were told they would come back, one child at a time, for three more visits over the next two weeks.

The practice session was held as a group rather than an individual activity to allow each child to function at their own level as a participant in a group rather than as an individual child being examined. This procedure was felt to be more culturally appropriate for these children's learning styles (Manuel-Dupont, 1987, 1989). While the examiner remained in the room with the child, the examiner did not view the slide-tape presentation with the child. Strong (1989) has an excellent review of literature which suggests that children tell

more complete stories when they believe their listener to be a naive listener.

In the third through fifth sessions, each child viewed the slide-tape presentation alone and told the story he/she had just seen to the examiner in the same manner as they had told the practice story. All stories were tape-recorded. In each session they were verbally rewarded for their story-telling ability and in the final session they were allowed to choose a toy for participating in the study.

Coding: Following the taping each tape was transcribed alphabetically following Strong's (1989) protocol. The transcribed tapes were then segmented into T-units. A T-unit is an independent clause with all of its dependent clauses attached [see Strong (1989) for a more detailed explanation]. Each T-unit was coded for number of words and number of clauses. The total T-units, total words, total clauses, words per story, words per T-unit, and words per clause were calculated. Each T-unit was then assigned a story grammar category and all stories were divided into episodes. Inter-coder agreement checks were completed for each of the following: 1) transcription, 2) T-unit segmentation, 3) all T-unit, word and clause counts, 4) story grammar categorization and, 5) episode identification. The level of inter-coder agreement was at least 90% for on each procedure.

Results

Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation: All subjects scored within normal ranges on the Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation. No child had significant articulation errors or deviances from Standard American English on this picture-identification task.

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-R: The scores on the PPVT-R ranged from Extremely Low to Moderately High. These scores are lower than would be expected of an Anglo mainstream population; however, test bias against minority populations is well-documented (Manuel-Dupont, 1987, 1989) and may account for the lower ranges of scores. A complete listing of the data is given in Table 4. As a whole, 51% of the

children tested received low scores, 44% received average scores, and 5% received high scores.

Length of text: This study is a replication of an earlier similar study done by Strong (1989) in which 78 children from Cache County, Utah, schools were shown the same Mercer Mayer slide-tape presentations with the same protocol. Of the 78 children, 39 were language-impaired and 39 were normally

Table 4: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-R Scores

Rating	Number of children	Percent
Extremely Low	6	14.6
Moderately Low	15	36.6
Low	0	0
Low Average	14	34.2
Average	0	0
High Average	4	9.8
Moderately High	2	2.9
High	0	0
Extremely High	0	0

developing. All were enrolled in the third, fourth, or fifth grades. Table 5 compares Ute children to normally developing (N) Anglo children and language-impaired (LI) Anglo children with respect to total number of T-units used to retell the story, the range of T-units from the minimum to the maximum for each sample, the total number of words used to tell each story, and the range of words for each sample.

In looking at each of the four categories of comparison, it is clear that for our first criteria, the Ute English speaking children did not produce stories that were significantly shorter than those of their Anglo counterparts. Indeed in every category the Ute children performed more like the Anglo normally developing children (N) than the language-impaired children (LI). Thus if the Ute English speaking child is producing "impoverished" narratives, the impoverishment

must come from content area rather than number of T-units or number of words used to tell a story.

Detail and explanation vs. intactness of text: One content measurement involving the use of detail and explanation is the number of complete episodes in each story. Every narrative is composed of at least one episode, thus episodes can be viewed as the building blocks of narratives. For a group of T-units to be considered an episode there must be at least one direct consequence and two of the following three story grammar categories: initiating event, attempt, and internal response (Roth & Spekman, 1986). If these elements

Table 5: Mean number of t-units, ranges and total words used by Ute, normal-language Anglo, and language-impaired Anglo children

Group	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Mean number of T-units used to create the story			
T-units-Ute	**25 (7.33)**	**31 (8.51)**	**25 (7.40)**
T-units-Anglo (N)	26 (6.32)	29 (9.88)	27 (7.39)
T-units-Anglo (LI)	18 (7.48)	21 (9.99)	19 (7.20)
Range of mean number of T-units used to create each story			
Range-Ute	**5-39**	**15-52**	**9-45**
Range-Anglo (N)	9-43	10-47	10-40
Range-Anglo (LI)	4-40	4-41	5-31
Mean number of words used to create each story			
Tot. words-Ute	**194 (64.82)**	**237 (76.29)**	**192 (61.91)**
Tot. words-Anglo (N)	223 (61.23)	248 (80.48)	218 (58.92)
Tot. words-Anglo (LI)	139 (66.02)	160 (81.03)	148 (83.62)
Range of mean number of words used to create each story			
Range-Ute	**38-344**	**81-469**	**67-331**
Range-Anglo (N)	68-357	78-382	110-333
Range-Anglo (LI)	23-287	16-321	31-25

(The mean is presented first, followed by the standard deviation in parentheses.)

are not present in the child's retelling of each episode, the episode is considered incomplete.

Each of the stories consisted of four episodes of varying length and complexity. Table 6 shows the frequency of the 7 story grammar categories within episodes of each story. From Table 6 it can be seen that the frequency with which each story grammar category occurred in each episode varied widely. In some cases categories did not occur at all in an episode (noted with "0" above) or were found at such a low level of occurrence that the child had few opportunities to adjust the text without losing that category completely. It should also be noted that some categories such as reaction (R) occur only in

Table 6: Number of story grammar categories in each episode of each target story

	Story Grammar Categories						
Story	**S**	**IE**	**A**	**P**	**IR**	**C**	**R**
				Story 1			
Episode 1	3	1	2	0	1	2	0
Episode 2	2	0	1	0	1	2	0
Episode 3	0	0	3	1	1	3	0
Episode 4	5	1	3	2	8	1	1
Total	**10**	**2**	**9**	**3**	**11**	**8**	**1**
				Story 2			
Episode 1	5	2	4	0	0	3	0
Episode 2	1	0	4	0	3	4	0
Episode 3	4	1	1	1	0	3	0
Episode 4	3	2	2	0	3	1	1
Total	**13**	**5**	**11**	**1**	**6**	**11**	**1**
				Story 3			
Episode 1	3	2	0	0	6	1	0
Episode 2	1	1	1	0	2	2	0
Episode 3	1	2	2	0	5	1	0
Episode 4	4	2	3	0	4	2	2
Total	**9**	**7**	**6**	**0**	**17**	**6**	**2**

the final episode thus a child did not have much opportunity to display knowledge of that category. Despite the varying occurrences of these categories across episodes, it is interesting to note that Ute children on the whole gave complete episodes for each of the four episodes of each story. In Table 7, it can be seen that only Episode 3 of the first story (noted with an "a") and Episode 1 of the third story (noted with a "b") had very low levels of completion.

Table 7: Percentage of Ute sample producing a complete episode

	Story		
Episode	**1**	**2**	**3**
1	83%	73%	37%b
2	51%	61%	68%
3	10%a	68%	66%
4	90%	80%	78%

Thus in response to the second area of measurement, Ute children tended to give narratives with intact episodic structures. If texts were shortened in an attempt to get to the point of the text, episodes were not eliminated entirely, the basic story structure was kept intact.

Usage of story grammar categories: In order to understand how Ute children used the story categories available in the target texts to create complete episodes, it is first necessary to see how they handled low-frequency vs. high-frequency story grammar categories. From the total indicated in Table 6 it is clear that the number of occurrences for plans and reactions were quite low across all three stories. In addition, the category of initiating event was low for the first story. In such low-frequency situations, if the child opted to change the one T-unit in which that category occurred, it would have had substantially more impact on the child's overall story grammar usage profile than in a high-frequency

situation. While this may seem to be unnecessarily unbalanced, it reflects the natural occurrence of these categories in narrative speech. Therefore it would have been unnatural to have "loaded" the target stories with more occurrences of these categories just to ensure that the child has the opportunity to use them.

Table 8: Percentage of Ute sample producing correct usage of each story grammar category

	Story		
Category	**1**	**2**	**3**
S	33	60	48
IE	65	67	61
A	64	5	61
P	32	17	--*
IR	31	38	32
C	73	61	60
R	32	44	50

*category does not occur in the target text.

To see how well Ute children handled the tasks of low- vs. high-frequency categories in the texts, Table 8 gives the percentage of correct usage of each category for the Ute sample as a whole. Table 8 clearly shows that Ute children did not utilize the low-frequency categories as often as they did the high-frequency categories, although they used the low-frequency category of initiating event in the first story to a much higher degree than plans or reactions. In fact, there was very little utilization of plans and reactions across all three stories. The most used categories were initiating event, attempts, and consequences. The low occurrence of settings in stories one and three and the overall low usage of internal response is predictable from the Northern Ute and Ute English literature which indicates that Ute English speakers do not spend a lot of time casting a story or talking about character's emotions and motivations. This is somewhat at

odds with the mainstream literature which says that older children should place emphasis on internal responses, attempts, and endings. The Ute English speaking children **do** use the attempt and direct consequence categories, but **do not** utilize the internal response and reaction categories to a high degree.

Table 9: Percentage of correct usage for Ute sample of each story grammar category by episodes

Category	Episode 1	2	3	4
			Story 1	
S	45	32	–	26
IE	70	–	–	59
A	60	55	55	76
P	--	–	73	10
IR	17	34	7	34
C	85	84	54	90
R	--	–	–	32
			Story 2	
S	69	34	47	78
IE	70	–	63	67
A	51	64	76	52
P	--	–	17	–
IR	--	39	–	37
C	73	49	55	95
R	--	–	–	44
			Story 3	
S	69	68	2	38
IE	38	78	62	73
A	--	88	84	37
P	--	–	–	–
IR	29	61	13	48
C	46	65	63	61
R	--	–	–	50

While it is interesting to note that certain categories are used frequently by Ute children and others are not, it is more informative to look at these categories across episodes in each story to determine if children "load up" certain episodes with certain categories or if the categories occur at a similar rate across episodes. Table 9 gives the percentage of correct usage of each category by episodes and shows several interesting trends. For the category of setting, the highest numbers are found in the first episode of each story and in episodes where new characters are introduced. Thus even though this category is not as highly used as others, it appears to have a clear function in the overall text. Settings are used to establish new characters in the story rather than setting up descriptive explanations of events. For a fuller understanding of the introduction of new characters see the texts of each story in the appendix.

The initiating event category, when it occurred in the target story, was repeated to a high degree of accuracy in nearly every episode of every story. The one exception is the first episode of the third story where there were initiating events separated by several internal responses. For example:

Original:
IE **He opened the box and looked in.**
S There was a baby frog.
IR Mike was happy to have a baby frog.
S But he had a big frog already.
IR And the big frog was not happy to see a new frog.
IR He was jealous of him.
IE **Mike put the baby frog down next to the big frog.**
IR The big frog said hello to the baby frog in a mean voice.

Ute:
S There was a this boy Mike that had a present and had a frog.
S And he already had a big frog.
IR The big frog was mad at the little frog.
IR Then a big one says hello in a mean voice.
(Initiating events deleted as episode is compressed.)

Where attempts occurred, they tended to be used frequently. In fact, many episodes seemed to be built around an initiating event - attempt - consequence sequence. One exception to the frequent use of attempts occured in episode 4 of story 3, where several actions of the main character occured in repetitive sentences. Ute children as a whole tended to collapse the similar syntactic patterns into a different sentence which conveyed the meaning of most of the target verbs. For example:

Original: **A They looked everywhere**
A They looked behind logs and in logs.
A Mike called for the baby frog.

Ute: **A They were looking all over for that frog.**

The plan category occurred infrequently across episodes and stories and, as a consequence, was not often used. The one exception to this tendency occurred in the third episode of the first story. One possible explanation for this high usage is that there were no target T-units containing initiating events, thus children used plans to complete the attempt-consequence triad.

Despite the high-frequency occurrence of the internal-response category in the target story, Ute children used it quite infrequently across most episodes of all stories. Where higher percentages did occur, it was consistently in the second and fourth episodes. It is not clear why those particular episodes would be favored.

The consequence category is the third member of the frequently utilized triad. Since this category is intimately tied with the measurement of episode completion (it must occur for an episode to be complete), it is not surprising, given the previous discussion of the high number of complete episodes, that this category is also frequently used. In addition, it becomes clearer why episode 3 of story 1 and episode 1 of story 3 were incomplete for this group of Ute subjects. In the first case, there were no initiating events available to complete the second half of the episodic completeness criteria (consequence

plus two of the three: initiating event, attempt, internal response). In addition the internal response category was rarely used.

In the second case (episode 1 of story 3) there were no attempts available, and the internal response category was infrequently used. From these examples, it becomes clear that Ute children created complete episodes with initiating events-attempts-consequences, and when these categories were limited in the target story, it was likely that the episode would be incomplete.

The final category, reaction, occured only in the last episode of each story and was used relatively infrequently, although a larger number of children did utilize this category in story 3 where there were twice the opportunities in the target story for its usage.

In summary, the most frequently used categories were initiating events, attempts, and consequences, which also were critical categories in episodic completion. The least frequently occurring categories seem to have had episode-specific uses. Settings were used most frequently in the first episode or whenever new characters were introduced, internal responses were used in the second and fourth episodes, and reactions were found in the fourth episodes only. Plans did not appear to be frequently used in Ute children's texts or for that matter, in the target texts. Thus Ute children performed as would be predicted from both mainstream and Northern Ute literature on initiating events, attempts, and consequences. They performed as predicted by Northern Ute literature on settings, plans, internal responses, and reactions.

Use of narrative ownership: The final category of analysis is the usage of narrative ownership (see Leap's article in this volume for a fuller discussion of this concept). One measurement of narrative ownership is the number of times Ute children delete, add, or change material in the text to create a text that is personalized. The deletion of material is clear from the previous discussions (settings, internal responses, plans, and reactions were low occurence categories for Ute children).

Since deletion was discussed in the previous sections, narrative ownership was measured by looking at the number and kinds of additions and substitutions Ute children made to the texts. Table 10 gives the number of additions, the most commonly added categories, and the percentage of the total that these common categories comprise for each episode of each story. For example, for story 1, episode 1, there were 31 total additions made by Ute children to this episode. The most common additions were S, A, and C (settings, attempts, and consequences), and these three categories comprised 77% of all the additions made. The other 23 % of additions were of very low frequency and are not listed individually in this table.

Table 10: Number and kinds of additions made to each episode of each story. The total number of additions is given first, followed by the most common categories added and the percentage of the total that the common categories comprise.

	Story		
Episode	**1**	**2**	**3**
1	n=31 S, A, C (77%)	n=62 S, A, C (85%)	n= 36 S, C, A (86%)
2	n=18 S,C (72%)	n=51 A, C, S (86%)	n=28 A, S, C (79%)
3	n= 72 A, C, P (90%)	n=33 S, A, C (76%)	n=34 IE, S, C (74%)
4	n=83 A, S, C, IR (96%)	n=40 S, C, A (88%)	n=51 S, IR, A (76%)

In looking at the concept of narrative ownership, it is interesting to note that Ute children in general "personalized"

their stories by adding similar kinds of information. The most frequent kinds of information added were settings, attempts, and consequences. The addition of settings is particularly interesting since Ute children tended to use very few of the target stories' original settings. Thus in using settings as additions, Ute children achieved narrative ownership by casting characters and physical environments in a manner that each child felt best fit the narrative situation. For example:

Original:
S One day a boy named Joe decided he wanted a pet frog.
S He got a net and a bucket to put the frog in.

Ute:
S A boy wanted a pet frog.
S An' he had a bucket an' a net to catch it.
+S The bucket was for him to put the frog in.

In this example, the child achieved narrative ownership by adding further explanation of the function of the bucket. The additional information may indicate that the child did not view the listener as being knowledgeable in the art of frog-catching, and therefore the child supplied details to explain the event more fully. It is interesting to note that another very low-frequency category, internal response, was often used as an addition to the final episodes of two of the three stories. Again, where Ute students did not utilize the target categories from the stories, they added character motivations from a more personalized experience or perhaps from more intense scrutiny of the facial expressions of characters in the slides. For example:

Original:
S So Mike went home and laid on his bed to cry.
IE But then they heard something wonderful.
S It was the sound of a baby frog.
IE And then the baby frog leaped through the window to join them.

Ute: S And Mike was cryin' on his bed.
IE And then they heard a frog sound.
+IR and then they were surprised
IE The baby frog jumped through the window.

In this example, the child chose to add emphasis to the emotions of the other characters in the story as a possible way of explaining their subsequent actions of greeting the frog. This use of narrative ownership is surprising, given the fact that internal responses are not often used.

A final area of interest in the analysis of additions is the use of repetition. Often a Ute child would give the target story grammar category and then would repeat the utterance either verbatim or with minimal lexical and/or syntactic differences immediately following the target.

Original: S One night when he and his dog were sleeping,
IE The frog climbed out of the jar.
IE He left through an open window.

Ute: S And when it came night
IE and the frog jumped out of his jar
+S Then when they were asleep
+IE the frog went out of his jar
IE and he jumped out of a open window

The use of repetition has been documented in the literature (Leap, 1989, 1990) and may indicate emphasis on ideas being repeated or a stylistic means of signaling the importance of one or more ideas over adjacent ideas.

Another area of analysis for the concept of narrative ownership is that of substitutions. Substitution was carried out in two different ways. The first method involved substituting one story grammar category for another. For example a common substitution for Ute children was to change IR (internal response) categories into A (attempts). This would be noted "A/IR" -- attempts have replaced the original internal response.

Original IR: The frog sat on a rock and felt sad to see them go.
Ute A: **They left.**

Original IR: Joe and his dog walked home feeling very angry that they didn't catch a frog.
Ute A: **And then he went home with no frog, him and his dog.**

The other method of substitution was to substitute one story grammar category for the same story grammar category. This occurred most often when Ute children decided to change the verb of a sentence. In the example below, one attempt has been substituted for a different attempt. This would be noted as "A/A". For example:

Original A: All day long Tom **called** for the frog.
Ute A: Tom **looked** for his frog all day.

In Table 11 the most frequent substitutions made by Ute children have been noted. The "X/Y" notation refers to one story grammar category being substituted for another, such as A/IR. The "X/X" category refers to one story grammar category being substituted for the same category. The first line "n=" refers to the total number of occurrences of that type of substitution. The second line shows overall percentages of this type of substitution. Examples of substitutions have been given on the third line only when a large number of children used the same substitution strategy. Finally the percentage for that particular substitution has been listed next to it.

In Table 11 it is also interesting to note that there were some substitutions made for each episode of each story. However, as a group, Ute children did not seem to favor the X/Y strategy or the X/X strategy. Each was used with about the same frequency--X/Y=53%, X/X=47%. The most frequent types of X/Y substitutions were initiating events replacing settings (IE/S), attempts replacing plans (A/P), and attempts replacing internal responses (A/IR). These substitutions may help to explain why Ute children used the plan and internal response categories so infrequently -- they were being replaced with attempts. Examples of each of these substitutions include:

Table 11: Number, kind, and percentage of substitutions made to each episode. The total number of substitutions is given first, followed by percentage of substitutions from that category (X/Y or X/X), then the most common substitutions used are given followed by the percentage of usage for that particular substitution pattern.

	Story		
Substitution	**1**	**2**	**3**
	Episode 1		
X/Y	n=0	n=26	n=5
	0	53%	26%
	–	IE/S (22%)	
X/X	n=6	n=23	n=14
	100%	47%	74%
		A/A (29%)	IR/IR (53%)
	Episode 2		
X/Y	n=6	n=36	n=1
	67%	32%	4%
X/X	n=3	n=77	n=23
	33%	68%	96%
		A/A (48%)	IR/IR (54%)
	Episode 3		
X/Y	n=5	n=51	n=7
	36%	78%	47%
		A/P (40%)	
X/X	n=9	n=14	n=8
	64%	22%	53%
	Episode 4		
X/Y	n=72	n=11	n=19
	91%	55%	54%
	A/IR (53%)	A/IR (34%)	
X/X	n=7	n=9	n=16
	9%	45%	46%
			IR/IR (20%)

Original: S: It was getting late.
P So Joe decided to go home without a pet frog.
IR He shook his fist and yelled good-bye.

Ute: **IE So they said it was too late. (IE/S)**
A Joe went home. (A/P)
A He was waving good-bye to the frog. (A/IR)

The most frequent type of X/X substitution was one attempt replacing another attempt (A/A), and one internal response replacing another internal response (IR/IR). Again it it interesting to note that one of the low-frequency categories for Ute children, internal response, was modified by substitution as well as addition as we saw from Tables 10 and 11. Examples of these types of substitutions include:

Original: R Mike was sad and started to cry.
IR So they all went home feeling very bad.

Ute: IR And Mike was sad and cryin.
IR And the animals were all mad at him. (IR/IR)

Original: A They called down holes.
Ute: **A They went and look in a holes. (A/A)**

In sum, it would appear that Ute children achieve some degree of narrative ownership over these retold stories by adding and modifying (substituting) story grammar categories. It is of further interest to note that whereas earlier in this discussion it appeared that Ute children did not favor or use certain low-frequency categories such as settings and internal responses, it is clear from the addition/substitution data that they understand these categories and are able to use them.

Conclusion

The literature on Northern Utes indicated that Ute children come from a richly varied linguistic background with at least six different language influences (Leap, in press). In addition it is likely that the oral language traditions of the Northern Ute community, like many other minority

communities, may not reflect the beliefs of mainstream society that language skills must be taught, rehearsed, corrected, and practiced (Manuel-Dupont, 1989; Leap, in press). Thus while Ute children come to school with intact and multipurpose oral "home" language skills, these skills do not appear to correlate well with literate "school" language requirements. In fact, as research on other minority groups has predicted (Heath, 1983), these adolescent children seem to demonstrate difficulty in using some of the narrative forms that are predicted to have been acquired by their age.

Literature on mainstream, mostly Anglo, adolescent children documents that they should 1) be able to tell detailed narratives, 2) use settings, initiating events, and consequences, 3) be concentrating on internal responses, attempts, and endings of narratives that are typically found in secondary (as opposed to primary) story plots, and 4) be aware of the needs of the listening audience, adjusting their narratives to appropriately fit the audience's needs.

Literature on Northern Ute and Ute English children documents that Ute children should 1) understand and utilize the concept of narrative ownership, 2) not elaborate on settings, internal responses, or reactions, 3) tell the story efficiently by getting to the point but not to the detriment of the story line in general, and 4) expect that the audience will share a knowledge base and belief system and thus will actively participate in supplying details and meanings to the narrative.

Several findings arose from the four areas of predicted conflict between these two literature bases: 1) length of text, 2) usage of detail and explanation, 3) usage of settings, character orientations, internal responses, initiating events, and consequences, and 4) establishment of narrative ownership.

For length of text Ute children produced narratives of similar length to Anglo children with mostly complete episodic structures within each narrative. While length could be separated somewhat independently from the other three factors, the remaining areas were highly inter-related. In incorporating detail and explanation, it appeared that Ute children used an initiating event-attempt-consequence triad to

put together narratives. While this was predicted by mainstream literature, this format (primary plot construction) is generally thought to be more characteristic of younger children. In putting together these narratives, Ute children demonstrated a more top-down rather than data-driven approach to the use of detail. That is, their stories did not show great evidence of emergence into Karmiloff-Smith's (1985) Phase 3 where details of data and relationships between ideas are both expressed. Yet, despite the brevity of detail, Ute children produced complete stories with personalized added details.

In producing these personalized stories, Ute children tended to avoid the target categories of setting, internal response, plan, and reaction from the target stories, yet they often used these categories as additions or substitutions. In fact the most common additions were settings, attempts, and consequences. The most common substitutions were attempts for internal responses and internal responses for other internal responses. The only infrequently used categories were plans and reactions, both of which had highly limited occurrences in the target text.

In all, adolescent Ute English discourse appears to be very home-language driven, perhaps best reflecting the structures of everyday conversations where discourse partners freely contribute to the flow and meaning of the conversation. In addition some culture-specific discourse strategies such as repetition seem to perform functions not codable under the current story grammar category profile. Despite these differences, there still remain elements which show emergence into literate "school" language patterns such as the usage of internal responses and settings as additions, even though these categories do not appear where mainstream literature predicts they will occur.

Implications

While it would certainly be simpler and more efficient for teachers to target Ute students as weak in narrative development, it would be a grave error to assume that extensive work needs to be done on teaching the concepts of

narrative development (for example, the story grammar categories). Ute students demonstrate quite adequately that they understand how narratives are put together and can use all of the grammar categories to construct their own narratives. However, Ute students' contructions are different from what teachers expect from them because the teachers' expectations are based on textbooks developed from research on mainstream students who speak Standard English.

This difference may be due to differences in audience analysis. These children may assume that the audience shares more knowledge with them than is actually the case. This affirms findings from Northern Ute narrative traditions which show much reliance on audience participation in narrative meaning construction. Or it may be that these constructions are closely aligned with similar constructions found in traditional Northern Ute, thus Ute children believe them to be the *socially appropriate* forms, above and beyond what they believe the role of the audience to be. Whatever the cause for these differences, drills and seat work are unlikely to facilitate changes, as it is highly unlikely that Ute students have conscious knowledge of these influences.

If teachers want to see differences in the the kind of language the Ute child uses in the classroom, for example -- school-language vs. home-language, the teacher must make an effort to understand the home-language of the Ute student, including its development and its socio-political purpose for existing. Secondly they must be careful to clearly design assignments that call for the usage of school-language over home-language if that is their purpose. For example, a composition assignment to write about the person they admire the most or the animal they like the best would most likely trigger a personalized home-language usage as the appropriate mode for reflecting and conveying information. A composition assignment about the impact of the Constitution on democracy in the United States would most likely trigger the need for school-language calling for analyzing, reflecting, and exemplifying. Finally, teachers must learn to work individually with students through conferencing, questioning, and working to understand what

the student believes the narrative to accomplish and why, so that it becomes clear to the student and the teacher what the differences are between these two modes of communication and why each is correctly and uniquely appropriate for different occasions.

Success in teaching school-language will only be accomplished when both students and teachers recognize the existence, importance, and functions of the home- and school-language traditions and do not try to learn or teach one to the exclusion of the other. Past experience alone should indicate to both groups that extermination of one communication system in favor of another, no matter which is selected as the target, leads to an overall diminishment of communicative skills. Thus, just as Northern Ute children have demonstrated the ability to use context-controlled story grammar categories, so should they be given the opportunity to expand this skill into context-controlled language traditions.

References

Botvin, S. J., & Sutton-Smith, B. (1977). The Development of Structural Complexity in Children's Fantasy Narratives. *Developmental Psychology, 13*, 377-388.

Dunn, Lloyd M., & Dunn, Leota M. (1981). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* (Revised). Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Goldman, R. & Fristoe, M. (1986). *Test of Articulation*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Heath, Shirley Bryce. (1980). The functions and uses of literacy. *Journal of Communication, 29*, 123-133.

---------. (1982a). Protean Shapes in Literacy Events: Ever Shifting Oral and Literate Traditions. In D. Tanner (Ed.), *Spoken and Written Language*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

---------. (1982b). What No Bedtime Story Means: Narrative skills at Home and School. *Language in Society, 11*, 49-76.

--------. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1985). Language and Cognitive Processes from a Developmental Perspective. *Language and Cognitive Processes, 1,* 61-85.

Leap, William. (1988). Assumptions and Strategies Guiding Mathematics Problem-solving by Ute Indian Students. In R. Cocking & J. Mestre (Eds.), *Language and cultural influences on learning mathematics* (pp. 161-186). NY: Erlbaum and Associates.

--------. (1989). "Snakes Never Sleep": The Significance of Ute English Non-sequitur Responses to Standard English Questions. *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual International Institute on Native American Language Issues.* Choctaw, OK: Native American Language Issues.

--------. (1990). Written Ute English: Texture, Construction, and Point of View. *Effective Language Education Practices and Native Language Survival.* (pp. 39-52). Choctaw, OK: Native American Language Issues.

--------. (in press). Pathways and Barriers Toward Ute Language Literacy Development on the Northern Ute Reservation. In Noonan, Mickey et al. (Eds.), *Linguistics and Literacy.* NY: Academic.

Lewis, Judy (1988). "What's it about? Mmmm a dead man comes back." An Anglo and Ute Student-centered Discourse Analysis. Unpublished manuscript. American University, Department of Anthropology, Washington, DC.

Mandler, J., & Johnson, N. (1977). Remembrance of Things Parsed: Story Structure and Recall. *Cognitive Psychology, 9,* 111-151.

Manuel-Dupont, Sonia (1987). Setting up a Language Assessment Program for Native American Children. In F. Ahenakew & S. Fredeen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual International Institute on Native American Language Issues,* Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan Indian Languages Institute.

-------- (1989). Should Monolingual Indian English Speaking Children Receive the same Educational Programming as Bilingual Indian English Speaking Children? *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual International Institute on Native American Language Issues.* Choctaw, OK: Native American Language Issues

Mayer, Mercer. (1967). *One frog too many.* New York: Dial Books for Young Readers.

--------. (1967). *A boy, a dog, and a frog.* New York: Dial Books for Young Readers.

--------. ('969). *Frog, Where are you?* New York: Dial Books for Yo\ng Readers.

-------- & Mayer, Marianna. (1974). *Fro\ goes to dinner.* New York: Dial Books for Young Readers.

Page, Judith L., & Stewart, Sharon R. (1985). Story Grammar Skills in School-age Children. *Topics in Language Disorders, 5,* 16-30.

Ripich, Danielle (1989). Building Classroom Communication Competence: A Multiperspective Approach. *Seminars in Language Disorders, 10,* 231-240.

Roth, Froma P. & Spekman, Nancy J. (1986). Narrative Discourse: Spontaneously Generated Stories of Learning-disabled and Normally Achieving Students. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 51,* 8-23.

Scollon, Ron, & Scollon, Suzanne B.K. (1981). *Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communication.* Norwood NJ: Ablex.

Scribner, Sylvia, & Cole, Michael (1981). *The Psychology of Literacy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Simon, Charlann S. (Ed.). (1985). *Communication Skills and Classroom Success: Therapy Methodologies for Language-learning Disable Students.* San Diego, CA: College-Hill.

Stein, N. & Glenn, C. (1979). An Analysis of Story Comprehension in Elementary School Children. In R. Freedle (Ed.). *New Directions in Discourse Processing* (Vol 2, pp. 53-120). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Strong, Carol. (1989). Stability of Oral Cohesion Skills of Language-impaired and Normally Developing School-aged Children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Tough, J. (1977). *The Development of Meaning.* New York: Wiley.

Wallach, Geraldine P., & Butler, Katherine G. (Eds.). (1984). *Language and Learning Disabilities in School-age Children.* Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins.

---------. & Miller, Lynda. (1988). *Language Intervention and Academic Success.* Boston, MA: College-Hill.

--------. (1989). Current Research as a Map for Language Intervention in theSschool Years. *Seminars in Language Disorders, 10,* 205-217.

Westby, Carol. (1985). Learning to talk--talking to learn: Oral-Literate Language Differences. In C. Simon (Ed.), *Communication Skills and Classroom Success: Therapy Methodologies for Language-learning Disabled Students* (pp. 182-213). San Diego, CA: College-Hill.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix

Target texts

1. Alphabetic letters refer to the story grammar categories:

S= setting
IE=initiating event
A= attempt
P= plan
IR=internal response
C= consequence
R= reaction

2. The percentages after each story grammar letter indicate the number of Ute children in the population who recited that line of the story correctly.

3. Dashed lines (------) separate episodes in the stories.

Story 1

S--59%	One day a boy named Joe decided he wanted a pet frog.
S--24%	He got a net and a bucket to put the frog in.
IE-70%	Then he and his dog started off to find one.
A--37%	Joe looked everywhere for a frog.
IR--78%	Then he saw one down in a little pond.
S--51%	It was sitting on a lily pad.
IR--17%	Joe and the dog were excited.
A--83%	And they went racing down the hill to catch the frog.
C--80%	But then they tripped over a branch!
C--85%	And they fell right into the pond!
S--41%	When they sat up in the water, they were looking right at the frog.
IR--34%	He looked at Joe and didn't move from his lily pad.
IR--34%	And he tried not to laugh.
S--22%	Joe looked very silly.
A--76%	Then Joe grabbed at the frog.
C--83%	But the frog leaped out of the way.

C--85% And he landed on a dead tree.

IR--7% "Now what should I do?" thought Joe.
P--73% So he told the dog to go to one end of the tree.
A--63% And then he climbed on the other end.
A--59% The dog ran straight at the frog.
A--44% And Joe raised his net.
C--85% But he dropped it right on the dog, not the frog.
C--63% The frog had already jumped away.
C--15% There sat Joe with his dog in the net.

IR--44% Now the frog was getting angry, because Joe was making him mad by trying to catch him.
S--29% It was getting late.
P--5% So Joe decided to go home without a pet frog.
IR--24% He shook his fist and yelled good-bye.
S--15% The frog sat on a rock
IR--66% and felt sad to see them go.
S--42% He had no friends in the pond to play with.
IR--27% Joe and his dog walked home feeling very angry that they didn't catch a frog.
S--10% And the frog sat alone on his rock.
IR--37% He was feeling very lonely.
P--17% So he decided to follow Joe and the dog.
A--85% He hopped up on the path and followed their tracks.
A--85% And he followed them right into a house.
A--56% He followed them right into a bathroom
S--34% where they were taking a bath.
IR--15% He stood in the doorway and smiled at them.
IE--59% Then he said "Here I am." "I want to play with you."
IR--46% Joe and the dog were very surprised to see him.
IR--27% And they were even more surprised
C--90% when he leaped into the bathtub to play with them.
R--32% And the three of them felt good to be together

Story 2

S--68% There once was a boy named Tom who had a pet frog.
S--51% He kept it in a large jar.
S--63% One night while he and his dog were sleeping
IE--76 the frog climbed out of the jar.

IE--63% He left through an open window.
S--88% When Tom woke up, he leaned over his bed to say good morning to the frog.
S--76% But the frog was gone!
A--90% Tom looked everywhere for the frog.
A--27% And the dog looked for him too.
A--46% Tom called out the window.
A--41% When the dog looked in the jar
C--76% he got his head caught.
C--80% And so, when he leaned out the window
C--63% The heavy jar made him fall.

A--61% Tom picked him up to see if he was okay.
IR--51% And the dog licked him for being so nice.
A--76% All day long Tim called for the frog.
A--61% He called down holes.
IR--37% A gopher got angry at Tom for disturbing him.
S--34% And while Tom was calling for the frog in a tree hole, the dog was getting into more trouble.
A--59% He barked at some bees and jumped at a tree where their bees' nest was hanging.
C--61% And the bees' nest fell down.
C--68% The angry bees chased the dog.
C--39% And an angry owl came out of the tree hole to scold Tom.
IR--29% It scared him.
C--27% The owl screeched at him to stay away from his home.

A--76% Next, Tom climbed a big rock and called again.
P--17% He leaned on some branches to see better.
C--27% But the branches began to move and carry him into the air.
S--37% They weren't branches.
S--66% They were a deer's antlers.
S--59% And the deer ran with Tom on his head.
S--27% The dog ran along too, barking at the deer.
IE--63% The deer stopped quickly at the edge of a cliff.
C--49% He threw Tom over the edge.
C--90% And he and the dog fell into a pond.

IE--80% Suddenly, they both heard something.
S--61% It was a croaking sound.
IR--12% And they smiled.

A–34% Tom told the dog to be quiet.
A–71% And they both crept up and looked behind a dead tree.
S--76% There was his frog sitting proudly with a mother frog.
S--98% And they had eight babies.
IE–54 One of the baby frogs leaped forward to greet him.
IR--61% He liked Tom.
IR--37% And Tom liked him.
C–95% So Tom took the baby frog home to be his new pet.
R--44% And he waved good-bye to his old frog who now had a family to take care of.

Story 3

S--93% One day there was a boy named Mike who got a surprise package.
IE--49% He opened a box and looked in.
S--83% There was a baby frog.
IR--15% Mike was happy to have a baby frog.
S--32% But he had a big frog already.
IR--41% And the big frog was not happy to see a new frog.
IR--61% He was jealous of him.
IE--27% Mike put the baby frog down next to the big frog.
IR--27% The big frog sad hello to the baby frog in a mean voice.
C–46% Then the big frog reached down and bit him on the leg.
IR--29% Mike told the big frog that he was very naughty.
IR--2% And he told him to be nice to the baby frog.

IE--78% Then Mike took his pets out to play.
S--68% The two frogs rode on the back of a turtle.
IR--46% But the big frog didn't like sharing the ride.
A–88% And soon the big frog kicked the baby frog off.
C–61% And the baby frog laid in the dirt crying.
IR--61% And again Mike told the big frog that he was naughty.
C–68% He told him to go home since he couldn't be nice.

IE--68% Then Mike took off on a raft with his pets.
IE--56% But the big frog didn't go home like he was told to do.
A–68% He jumped onto the raft.
IR--10% And he glared angrily at the baby frog for getting him into trouble.
A--100% Then he kicked the baby frog off the raft into the water.

IR--5% "Take that!" he said.
S--10% Then the big frog sat on the raft
IR--2% happy that the baby frog was gone.
C--63% But one of the other pets told Mike what happened.
IR--15% "Oh no!" said Mike.
IR--24% "Where's the baby frog?"

S--2% The baby frog was gone.
S--5% And they couldn't find him.
A--80% They looked everywhere.
A--24% They looked behind logs and in logs.
A--5% Mike called for the baby frog.
C--56% But they couldn't find him.
IR--68% Mike was sad and started to cry.
IR--59% So they all went home feeling very bad.
IR--51% Even the big frog felt sad.
IR--12% He didn't mean to make him cry.
S--85% Mike went home and laid on his bed to cry.
IE--71% But then they heard something wonderful.
S--61% It was the sound of a baby frog.
IE--76% And then the baby frog leaped through the window to join them!
C--66% He jumped right on the big frog's head.
R--51% The big frog was happy to see the baby frog back.
R--49% And he promised to be nice to him from now on.